

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group
Meeting Summary
February 26, 2002

Members Attending: Kathleen Gaiser, Bob Leidich, Tom McCleary, Bill Skowronski, Laura Hobson, Anjali Mathur, Marcia Smith, Mary Smith, Marvin Smith, Cher Salley, Bill Davis, Paige Akins, Emily Lee, Amy Simpson, Timothy Neiberding, Mike Suver, Stuart Greenberg, Doug Broussard, Glenn Landers, Joe Calabrese, Holly Deillisanti, Lyn Luttner, Jeanette Marrero, Dan Joyce, Janet Cohen, Jeff Citin, Bill Long, Steve Fruh, Herb Mausser, Victoria Peterlin, Pauline Johnston, George Coder

Members Absent: Virginia Aveni, Reverend Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domanovic, Eleanor Bycoski, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Elizabeth Shaw, Richard King, Dennis Finn.

Facilitators: Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman, and Doreen Swetkis

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the eighth time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators began by reviewing the agenda and noted that they would be preparing this meeting summary.

Decisions Made

Number	Decision	Cost
#13	Securing Group logo and slogan	\$3,000-\$4,999
#14	Booth rental at Earthfest 2002	
#15	Booth rental at Tri-City event	

Review December Meeting Summary

The facilitators reviewed the status of the January meeting summary. The Working Group had no questions or concerns, and the summary was approved.

Current Work Group Strategy

The facilitator presented the Current Work Group Strategy sheet of information to the group, asking the group if it is the right strategy, and commented that group members may have ideas they want to add to the list. On this Strategy sheet was outlined the original 3 goals of the project, available resources, information that had been learned regarding air toxics in Cleveland, and a review of short-term projects that the group had already agreed to implement. The comments regarding the Strategy included the following.

- The Group was focusing on stuff that was too “off the shelf.”
- The business sector was not represented at the table in sufficient numbers.
- The Group needs to start making strategic decisions and to move forward with implementation of these decisions in a timely manner. Otherwise, people will start to leave the Group, and project implementation will begin to be ignored.
- The Group needs community support in its endeavors.
- Too much time was spent at the beginning of the project on ground rules and process.
- EPA has given the Group a pre-organized project, and so is not empowering the Group enough.
- The Group needs to now prioritize its themes/projects.

Someone stated that the Group, at the pace it was currently working, was not worth the time and effort that was being put into it. Other Group members commented that the Group was actually where it should be in terms of process, that the current process is realistic, that consensus building takes a lot of time and is a good learning process, and that small projects have been implemented.

The facilitator asked if the Group could find a balanced pace between process and action. Various Group members responded as follows.

- The Group needs to move beyond process; there is not enough substance.
- The Group needed to focus on the who, what, when, where, how of project implementation.
- The details regarding project implementation should rest in the subcommittees.
- Are the subcommittees doing enough?
- More communication needs to happen between subcommittee members between monthly meetings.
- There does not need to be more meetings, just more communication between meetings.
- The Group needs to come up with a timeline.

At this point, the facilitator presented the Group with the timeline that the EPA and the facilitators considered just before the current meeting. The timeline divides the work of the Group into 3 Phases that cover group process, project implementation, and group/project sustainability and replicability. Members noted:

- The timeline seemed reasonable;
- It was a good starting point; and,
- It's good to have a timeline.

It was decided that subcommittees would begin to present their proposed projects during the next meeting.

The facilitator asked if the Group felt that there was anyone missing from the Group who needed to be considered. He referred to an earlier comment that the business sector did not have enough

representation in the Group, and updated the group on what had developed in this regard since the Project began namely:

- The representative from Goodrich left and did not send a replacement;
- Repeated contact has been attempted in trying to secure a CEI/First Energy representative and EPA will continue to try;
- ALCOA is represented in subcommittee; and,
- The representative from Dayglo is still active.

It was commented that some OH EPA folks were meeting with First Energy in March, and that maybe it would help if the Group knew what projects it was implementing so it could target specific businesses to approach. The question was asked why there was such a focus on business, asking if they were the worst offenders. One member commented that the people who live in the community are concerned about emissions from businesses. Another commented that there was community representation and government representation, but not enough from the business sector; business needed to be at the table for real change to happen. The facilitator suggested that this issue be turned over to the business subcommittee.

Discussion of Proposed Draft for Decisionmaking Process for Reviewing, Prioritizing, and Selecting Projects and Expending Funds

The facilitator began the discussion of the draft criteria composed by the facilitators for choosing proposed projects by referring group members to the list of draft criteria and asking if these were the right criteria. Group members made the following comments regarding these criteria:

- It was suggested that some of the criteria were too vague and confusing, and the wording should be changed:
 - #1 be changed to “reduce exposure to toxics by greater # of people;”
 - #2 be changed to “transportable/replicable across the city;”
 - #3 to “projects of sufficient size to result in meaningful reductions;
 - #12 removed because it is redundant and can be folded into #1; and,
 - #14 added regarding implementation of projects “within 12 months.”
- The Group should not discount this set just because it’s not transferable; what’s good for only one or a few neighborhoods may still be worth doing.
- This is a general framework/list of general themes. So now let us focus our discussion on setting up a definite framework.

At this point, a member presented the business sub-committee’s criteria, which they had developed earlier that evening. The member stated that when the business subcommittee found that their targeting a sector would not reduce toxics meaningfully, it was decided that they needed to develop a set of criteria for this:

- 8 criteria and system for ranking each sector efficacy—appropriateness of projects (it allows for comparisons of projects) and all would be weighted on a 100-point scale, then scored per each project; and scaled per project per criteria. The criteria include:

- 1. # of facilities/sources in area
 - 2. % of chemicals emitted (actual reductions made)
 - 3. risk-drivers/toxicity
 - 4. existing pollution-prevention programs
 - 5. infrastructure-active trade association/good agency working relationships with trade association.
 - 6. neighborhood concern/interest
 - 7. demonstrable/measurable results
 - 8. data/monitoring/information
- Comments from members regarding these criteria:
 - What about potential risk?
 - These don't fit well with the work of other subcommittees, and some projects are hard to quantify beforehand (e.g., chemical collection day).
 - This is a good start to move toward implementation.
 - It is a tool, not absolute; the Group does not have to use it.
 - Cost, sustainability, and timeliness are missing and need to be considered.
 - Some projects won't fit, but should still be considered.
 - At this point, a member mentioned that there were four original criteria that were decided upon at an earlier Group meeting: measurability, timeliness, replicability, and cost. Through the ensuing discussion, members added four more criteria to this original list: emissions reduction, risk, sustainability, and ability to be implemented. Another member commented that she did not find that list helpful.
 - The facilitator suggested that the Group take the discussion "offline," and that the facilitators would prepare a summary of what had been said and email it to Group members for comments and questions between now and the next Group meeting. One member suggested that the facilitators add definitions by each criteria to avoid any ambiguity. The facilitator reminded the members that in the end, they will be making value judgments when picking projects.

Discussion of Updates and Actions Needed on Outreach Planning Meeting

The facilitator referred the Group to the Ad Hoc Outreach Meeting Minutes from 2/11/02, and asked Group members to comment if they thought each activity was worthwhile, and who would be the point person(s) for a given project. The following describes the results of this discussion

Event	Worthwhile	Activity	Point Person(s)
Press event w/Mayor Campbell	Yes	Contact Mayor	Lyn, Bob L.
Logo and Slogan (3 bids have been secured)	Yes	Secure logo and/or slogan by May	Emily, George, Mary
Brochures	NA	NA	TBD
Earthfest	Yes	Rent booth	Anjali, Paige

Tri-City (Tri-C 30 th Anniversary)	Yes	Rent booth, (also gas can trade-in?)	Herb, Anjali, Paige, Joe
---	-----	--------------------------------------	--------------------------

Update on Long-Term Funding Mechanism for Projects

EPA's member updated the Working Group about options for a funding mechanism for the pilot. She handed out a sheet upon which was outlined three possible funding options for the proposed projects. She stated that she preferred option 2 because it allowed for organizations not currently in the Working Group to respond to the RFP. The Group decided to support EPA's recommendation and use funding option 2. She asked the Group for their comments regarding criteria for evaluating the proposals, and for suggestions as to who outside the group should be sent an RFP. Mary and Bill are going to put together a list of agencies they think would be interested in receiving the RFP and will send the list to Group members for their comments and additions. The EPA member stated that the list would be out in the next week or two. She also stated that she would be willing to fly a Group member to D.C. to help in evaluating the received proposals, although the member would not be able to vote.

Other Business and Scheduling Next Meeting

New Member

The facilitator asked the Group to vote on whether Reverend Frank can join the Group. The group unanimously approved his membership as a representative of Slavic Village.

Slide Presentation

EPA and the ad hoc outreach group had designed a slide presentation on the work of the Air Toxics Working Group. The facilitator asked what members would be willing to show the presentation to others over the next month. A member stated that she would show the presentation in her four training session in March, and St. Clair Superior Members agreed to show the presentation at the St. Clair-Superior quarterly meeting.

Next Meeting

The American Lung member commented that she does not have email, and so she is not receiving documents in a timely fashion. The facilitator said that she would send Ms. Lee copies via US mail.

The facilitator mentioned that he will have another draft of the criteria discussed during this meeting within the next week, and would then distribute it via email to the members so that any comments or concerns could be discussed and/or incorporated into the draft before next meeting in order to expedite next meeting's discussion of and voting on the criteria. The final set of criteria is to be used for judging what projects will be undertaken by the group.

The facilitators polled the Working Group on possible dates for the April meetings, noting that there would be no meeting in March but two in April. The dates suggested were Monday, April 1 and Monday, April 29 or 30, 2002 for the next full meeting of the working group.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m. Please note that EPA's website for this pilot is at <http://www.epa.gov/cleveland/>